[31st January 1936

A.—(*a*) The Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, does not provide for the passing by municipal councils of a vote of censure on their Commissioners. The hon. Member apparently refers to the resolution passed by certain municipal councils recommending the removal of their Commissioners under the powers vested in them under sub-section (4) of section 12-C of the Act.

(*b*) Tinnevelly, Coimbatore, Palni and Ellore municipalities. The Tanjore Municipal Council passed a resolution asking for the transfer of its Commissioner which was not in the terms of section 12-C of the Act.

(*c*) & (*d*) The Tinnevelly Municipal Council passed the resolution on 16th May 1934, the Coimbatore Municipal Council on 1st March 1935, the Palni Municipal Council on 5th August 1935 and the Ellore Municipal Council on 28th September 1935. In pursuance of these resolutions, the Government under section 12-C of the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920, replaced the Commissioners of these municipalities by the appointment of other officials. The resolution of the Tanjore Municipal Council was not complied with, but the Commissioner in question has since been reverted to Government service. Copies of the resolutions and of the orders of Government issued thereon are placed on the table of the House.[a]

Representation of Vannikula Kshatriyas in the cadre of Municipal Commissioners.

* 650 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the names of all Municipal Commissioners (since the question on the subject was answered last time) and the community to which they belong, also where they are working; and

(*b*) the number of Vannikula Kshatriyas employed as Municipal Commissioners and also their names?

A.—(*a*) A statement [b] showing the particulars relating to the fresh appointments of Commissioners, subsequent to question No. 380 answered on the 1st November 1935, is appended.

(*b*) The Vannikula Kshatriya is a sub-sect of the non-Brahman (Hindu) community and the total number of non-Brahman (Hindus) now working as Commissioners is forty-five.

Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur:—" May I know, Sir, who is the recommending authority for this particular appointment? "

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 318–320 infra.
[b] Printed in Appendix III on page 320 infra.

31st January 1936]

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" The Government themselves have prepared certain lists of suitable candidates. Whenever vacancies arise selection is made out of them."

Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur :—" May I know whether any candidate from the community applied for appointment? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I cannot answer the question, because the Vanniyakula Kshatriya is a sub-sect of the non-Brahman community and no separate representation is given to sub-sects."

Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur :—" In what order does the community stand for such appointments? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" Certainly if eligible candidates are available they will be appointed."

Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur :—" Does it mean that they should be B.As. or M.As.? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" For many of these appointments there is no direct recruitment. Government servants and employees of Local Boards and Municipal Councils in active service are selected for these posts."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—" May I know whether any application has been received during the last year from Vanniyakula Kshatriyas? "

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I am not aware of having received any application."

Alleged interference of Government with the Tanjore District Board in regard to consideration of supplemental subjects.

* 651 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Government have interfered with the Tanjore District Board in the latter's consideration of supplemental subjects at a meeting of that board, before it was bifurcated;

(*b*) what the reasons were that prompted the Government to interfere in such a way;

(*c*) on whose representations the matter was taken up; and

(*d*) whether a copy of the representations made as well as a copy of the order thereon will be placed on the table?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government called upon the old Tanjore District Board before bifurcation to show cause why certain resolutions passed at its meeting held on 1st October 1934 should not be cancelled for the reason that the members were not given the statutory ten days' notice of the subject-matter of the resolutions. After considering its reply they decided not to cancel the resolutions as the Board had regularized the resolutions by having them confirmed at a subsequent meeting.